

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-17, and 19-34 are currently pending in the application. Claims 2 and 18 have been canceled. Claims 1, 3-17, and 19-34 have been amended. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-6, 8-15, 26, 28-30, and 32-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,088,598 to Marsolais ("Marsolais").

Independent claim 1 relates to a method for setting operational parameters of a mobile terminal. Applicant respectfully submits that Marsolais fails to teach or suggest at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 1, namely, transmitting a zone information request from the mobile terminal and responsive to the request, receiving zone information at the mobile terminal, wherein the zone information includes an identifier of the mobile terminal.

Marsolais discloses a method and apparatus for displaying greetings to mobile terminals identifying services associated with location based services. A system identifies a plurality of service zones and transmits predefined services to mobile terminals when located in the service zones. The system transmits from each base station local zone profile information to each of the mobile terminals located in those zones. Each mobile terminal has stored therein subscriber zone profile information for which that mobile terminal can receive location based services. The mobile terminal also stores an associated greeting for each zone of subscriber zone profile information. The mobile terminal compares transmitted local zone information with a list of stored subscriber zone profile information, and when a match is found, the mobile terminal displays the greeting associated with the subscriber zone profile information.

In contrast to claim 1, there is no teaching or suggestion by Marsolais of transmitting a zone information request from the mobile terminal and responsive to the request, receiving zone information at the mobile terminal. In Marsolais, when a mobile station is powered on for the first time in a cellular system, the mobile station sends a registration request to a mobile switching center. However, the request as disclosed in Marsolais does not correspond to a zone information request as in claim 1. In addition, Marsolais does not teach, suggest, or anticipate an

identifier of the mobile terminal being included in the zone information. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 distinguishes over Marsolais and is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 as anticipated by Marsolais is respectfully requested.

Dependent claim 2 has been canceled rendering the rejection thereof moot. Dependent claims 3-6 and 8-15 depend from and further restrict independent claim 1 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 1, dependent claims 3-6 and 8-15 distinguish over Marsolais and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 3-16 and 8-15 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 26 relates to a zone information transmitter for signaling a zone information. Applicant respectfully submits that Marsolais fails to teach or suggest at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 26, namely, a first transmission means receiving a zone information request and wirelessly sending out an allocated zone information in a limited transmission area, wherein the zone information includes an identifier of the mobile terminal. In contrast to claim 26, in Marsolais, when a mobile station is powered on for the first time in a cellular system, the mobile station sends a registration request to a mobile switching center. However, the request as disclosed in Marsolais does not correspond to a zone information request as in claim 26. In addition, Marsolais does not teach, suggest, or anticipate an identifier of the mobile terminal being included in the zone information. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 26 distinguishes over Marsolais and is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 26 as anticipated by Marsolais is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 28-30 depend from and further restrict independent claim 26 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 26, dependent claims 28-30 distinguish over Marsolais and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 28-30 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 32 relates to a method for setting operational parameters of a mobile terminal. Applicant respectfully submits that Marsolais fails to teach or suggest at least

one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 32, namely, transmitting a zone information request from the mobile terminal and responsive to the request, receiving the zone information at the mobile terminal, wherein the zone information includes an identifier of the mobile terminal. In contrast to claim 32, in Marsolais, when a mobile station is powered on for the first time in a cellular system, the mobile station sends a registration request to a mobile switching center. However, the request as disclosed in Marsolais does not correspond to a zone information request as in claim 32. In addition, Marsolais does not teach, suggest, or anticipate an identifier of the mobile terminal being included in the zone information. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 32 distinguishes over Marsolais and is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 32 as anticipated by Marsolais is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 33-34 depend from and further restrict independent claim 32 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 32, dependent claims 33-34 distinguish over Marsolais and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 33-34 is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsolais in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,178,330 to Alberty et al. ("Alberty"). Claim 7 depends from and further restricts independent claim 1 and therefore also distinguishes over Marsolais. In rejecting claim 7, the Examiner has further applied Alberty. Alberty has been cited as teaching a second transmission means that is deactivated by setting transmission parameters. Applicant respectfully submits that Alberty fails to cure the deficiencies of Marsolais noted above with respect to independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claim 7 distinguishes over the cited combination of Marsolais and Alberty and respectfully requests that the rejection thereof be withdrawn.

Claims 16, 18-25, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsolais in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,377,816 to Shinoda et al. ("Shinoda").

Independent claim 16 relates to a mobile terminal having operational parameter settings. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Marsolais and Shinoda fails to

teach or suggest at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 16, namely, a first transmission means for transmitting a zone information request and responsive to the request receiving zone information, wherein the zone information includes an identifier of the mobile terminal.

In contrast to claim 16, in Marsolais, when a mobile station is powered on for the first time in a cellular system, the mobile station sends a registration request to a mobile switching center. However, the request as disclosed in Marsolais does not correspond to a zone information request as in claim 16. In addition, Marsolais does not teach, suggest, or anticipate an identifier of the mobile terminal included in the zone information. Shinoda fails to cure the deficiencies of Marsolais in that Shinoda also does not teach, suggest, or render obvious a first transmission means for transmitting a zone information request and responsive to the request receiving zone information as in claim 16. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 16 distinguishes over the cited combination of Marsolais and Shinoda. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 16 is respectfully requested.

Dependent claim 18 has been canceled rendering the rejection thereof moot. Dependent claims 19-25 depend from and further restrict independent claim 16 in a patentable sense. Dependent claim 31 depends from and further restrict independent claim 26 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claims 16 and 26, respectively, dependent claims 19-25 and 31 distinguish over the cited combination of Marsolais and Shinoda and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 19-25 and 31 is respectfully requested.

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsolais in view of Shinoda and further in view of Alberty. Claim 17 depends from and further restricts independent claim 16 and therefore also distinguishes over Marsolais. In rejecting claim 17, the Examiner has further applied Shinoda and Alberty. Alberty has been cited as teaching a second transmission means that is deactivated by setting transmission parameters. Applicant respectfully submits that Shinoda and Alberty fail to cure the deficiencies of Marsolais noted above with respect to independent claim 16. Applicant respectfully submits

that dependent claim 17 distinguishes over the cited combination of Marsolais, Shinoda and, Albery and respectfully requests that the rejection thereof be withdrawn.

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsolais in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0078354 to Pass ("Pass"). Claim 27 depends from and further restricts independent claim 26 and therefore also distinguishes over Marsolais. In rejecting claim 27, the Examiner has further applied Pass. Pass has been cited as teaching a wireless server. Applicant respectfully submits that Pass fails to cure the deficiencies of Marsolais noted above with respect to independent claim 26. Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claim 27 distinguishes over the cited combination of Marsolais and Pass and respectfully requests that the rejection thereof be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated:

May 24, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Stanley R. Moore

Registration No.: 26,958

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200

Dallas, Texas 75202

(214) 855-4500

Attorneys For Applicant